

BANACH SPACES OF THE TYPE OF TSIRELSON

S. A. Argyros and I. Deliyanni

Abstract . To any pair $(\mathcal{M}, \theta)$, where $\mathcal{M}$ is a family of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$, compact in the pointwise topology, and $0 < \theta < 1$, we associate a Tsirelson-type Banach space $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$. It is shown that if the Cantor-Bendixson index of $\mathcal{M}$ is greater than n and $\theta > \frac{1}{n}$ then $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ is reflexive. Moreover, if the Cantor-Bendixson index of $\mathcal{M}$ is greater than ω then $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ does not contain any ℓ^p , while if the Cantor-Bendixson index of $\mathcal{M}$ is finite then $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ contains some ℓ^p or c_0 . In particular, if $\mathcal{M} = \{A \subset \mathbf{N} : |A| \leq n\}$ and $\frac{1}{n} < \theta < 1$ then $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ is isomorphic to some ℓ^p .

Notation . We denote by c_{00} the space of finitely supported sequences.

$\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is the canonical basis in c_{00} .

If $E \subset \mathbf{N}$ and $x \in c_{00}$, we denote by Ex the restriction of x to E , that is $Ex = x.X_E$.

For E, F nonvoid subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ we write $E < F$ for $\max E < \min F$. We write $n < E$ for $\{n\} < E$.

If $E_i \subset \mathbf{N}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $E_1 < E_2 < \dots < E_n$ we say that $E_1, \dots, E_n$ are **successive sets**.

For $x \in c_{00}$, $\text{supp}(x)$ is the set $\{i : x_i \neq 0\}$.

If $x_i \in c_{00}$, $x_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\text{supp}(x_1) < \dots < \text{supp}(x_n)$ we say that $x_1, \dots, x_n$ are **successive vectors**.

Finally, $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the ℓ^p norm, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

We recall that the norm $\|\cdot\|_T$ on Tsirelson's space T is defined by the following implicit equation.

$$\text{For all } x \in T \quad \|x\|_T = \max\{\|x\|_{\infty}, \frac{1}{2} \sup \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\|_T\},$$

where the "sup" is taken over all n and all sequences $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ of successive subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ with $n \leq \min E_1$.

It is well known that Tsirelson's space is a reflexive space not containing any ℓ^p ([T]).

Λ

A basic notion in the definition of Tsirelson's space is that of a "Schreier set". A finite set A is called a Schreier set if $|A| \leq \min A$. The above mentioned properties of Tsirelson's space are consequences of the following two properties of the class $\mathcal{S}$ of Schreier sets:

- 1) $\mathcal{S}$ does not contain infinite increasing sequences of sets.
- 2) $\mathcal{S}$ contains arbitrarily large (finite) sets.

This leads us to the following generalization:

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a set of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$. We say that $\mathcal{M}$ is **compact** if the set $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M}) = \{X_A : A \in \mathcal{M}\}$ is a compact subset of the Cantor space $2^{\mathbf{N}}$.

Definition 1 . Let $\mathcal{M}$ be as above. A family $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ of successive finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ is said to be $\mathcal{M}$ -admissible if there exists a set $A = \{m_1, \dots, m_n\} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $m_1 \leq E_1 < m_2 \leq E_2 < \dots < m_n \leq E_n$.

Definition 2 . Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a compact family. Let $0 < \theta < 1$. We define the $(\mathcal{M}, \theta)$ -Tsirelson-type space $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ as follows:

$T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ is the completion of c_{00} under the norm $\|\cdot\|$ satisfying the implicit equation

$$\text{For all } x \in c_{00} \quad \|x\| = \max\{\|x\|_{\infty}, \theta \sup \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\|\},$$

where the "sup" is taken over all n and all $\mathcal{M}$ -admissible families $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$.

Remark . It is easy to see that $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a 1-unconditional basis for $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$.

Let us now recall the notion of the Cantor-Bendixson index of a countable compact space W .

Given a countable compact space W , one defines the sequence $W^{(\lambda)}$, $\lambda < \omega_1$ as follows:

$$W^{(0)} = W$$

$$W^{(\lambda+1)} = \{x \in W : x \text{ is a limit point of } W^{(\lambda)}\}$$

$$\text{and for a limit ordinal } \lambda, \quad W^{(\lambda)} = \bigcap_{\mu < \lambda} W^{(\mu)}$$

The Cantor-Bendixson index of W is then defined as the least $\lambda < \omega_1$ for which $W^{(\lambda)} = \emptyset$.

We state without proofs the following results:

Theorem 1 . Let $\mathcal{M}, \theta$ be as in the definition of $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$. Suppose that there is $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that the Cantor-Bendixson index of $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$ is at least $n+1$ and $\frac{1}{n} < \theta < 1$. Then $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ is reflexive.

Theorem 2 . If the Cantor-Bendixson index of $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$ is greater than ω then $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ does not contain isomorphically any ℓ^p .

In the opposite direction we have the following result:

Theorem 3 . If the Cantor-Bendixson index of $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$ is finite, then the space $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ contains an isomorphic copy of ℓ^p , for some $1 < p < +\infty$, or c_0 .

We shall present here a special case of Theorem 3, namely the case where $\mathcal{M} = \{A \subset \mathbf{N} : |A| \leq n\}$ for some $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

Theorem 3a . Let $n \in \mathbf{N}, n \geq 2$ be fixed. If $\mathcal{M} = \{A \subset \mathbf{N} : |A| \leq n\}$ and $\frac{1}{n} < \theta < 1$ then the space $T_{\mathcal{M}}^{\theta}$ is isomorphic to ℓ^p , where $\frac{1}{p} + \log_n(\frac{1}{\theta}) = 1$.

In other words: The norm $\| \cdot \|$ defined on c_{00} by the implicit equation

$$\|x\| = \max\left\{\|x\|_\infty, \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{q}}} \sup \sum_{i=1}^d \|E_i x\|\right\},$$

where the "sup" is taken over all $d \leq n$ and all sequences of successive sets $(E_1, \dots, E_d)$, is equivalent to the ℓ_p norm, where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$.

Proof : For the proof we first need to deal a little with the dual of $T_{\mathcal{M}}^\theta$.

We define inductively a sequence $\{K_s\}_{s=0}^\infty$ of subsets of $[-1, 1]^{(N)}$ as follows:

$$K_0 = \{-e_n : n \in \mathbf{N}\}$$

and for $s \in \mathbf{N}$

$$K_{s+1} = K_s \cup \{\theta \cdot (f_1 + \dots + f_d) : d \leq n, f_i, i = 1, \dots, n \text{ are successive and } f_i \in K_s\}$$

It is not difficult to see that for every $x \in c_{00}$

$$\|x\| = \sup_{f \in \bigcup_{s=1}^\infty K_s} \langle f, x \rangle$$

The proof of the Theorem goes through four steps:

Step 1

For every $x \in c_{00}$ $\|x\| \leq \|x\|_p$.

Proof : It is enough to show that for every s and every $f \in K_s$, $|f(x)| \leq \|x\|_p$.

This is done by induction on s .

For $f \in K_0$ it is trivial. Suppose that for some s we have that for all $f \in K_s$ and all $y \in c_{00}$ $|f(y)| \leq \|y\|_p$. Let $x \in c_{00}$ and $f = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{q}}}(f_1 + \dots + f_d) \in K_{s+1}$, where $d \leq n$, $f_1, \dots, f_n$ are successive and belong to K_s .

Then, setting $x_i = (\text{supp}(f_i))(x)$ we have

$$|f(x)| \leq \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{q}}} \sum_{i=1}^d |f_i(x)| = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{q}}} \sum_{i=1}^d |f_i(x_i)| \leq$$

$$\frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{q}}} \sum_{i=1}^d \|x_i\|_p \leq \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^q \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \|x_i\|_p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \|x\|_p$$

by the induction hypothesis and Hölder's inequality.

Step 2

For all $m \in \mathbf{N}$ $\frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{p}}} m^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \|\sum_{i=1}^m e_i\|$.

Proof : Suppose first that $m = n^s$ for some $s \in \mathbf{N}$. The functional $f = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{s}{q}}}(\sum_{i=1}^{n^s} e_i)$ clearly belongs to K_s . So

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n^s} e_i\right\| \geq f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n^s} e_i\right) = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{s}{q}}} n^s = n^{s(1-\frac{1}{q})} = n^{\frac{s}{p}} = m^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

Now let $m \in \mathbf{N}$ and find s such that $n^s \leq m \leq n^{s+1}$. Then

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m e_i \right\| \geq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n^s} e_i \right\| = n^{\frac{s}{p}} = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{p}}} n^{\frac{s+1}{p}} \geq \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{p}}} m^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Step 3

For every normalized block sequence $(x_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ of the basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ we have

$$\left\| \sum a_k x_k \right\| \leq \frac{2}{\theta} \left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\|$$

for all coefficients (a_k) .

Proof : It is enough to show that for every $\phi \in \cup_{s=1}^\infty K_s$ one gets

$$\phi\left(\sum a_k x_k\right) \leq \frac{2}{\theta} \left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\|$$

For the proof we need the following technical notions:

Definition A. Let $m \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\phi \in K_m \setminus K_{m-1}$. We call **analysis** of ϕ any sequence $\{F^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$ of subsets of $\cup_{s=1}^\infty K_s$ such that:

1) For every s $F^s(\phi)$ consists of successive elements of K_s and

$$\cup_{f \in F^s(\phi)} \text{supp}(f) = \text{supp}(\phi).$$

2) If f belongs to $F^{s+1}(\phi)$ then either $f \in F^s(\phi)$ or there is a $d \leq n$ and successive $f_1, \dots, f_d \in F^s(\phi)$ with $f = \theta(f_1 + \dots + f_d)$.

3) $F^m(\phi) = \{\phi\}$.

Remark. It is clear by the definition of the sets K_s that each $\phi \in \cup K_s$ has an analysis.

Also one can check that if $f_1 \in F^s(\phi)$, $f_2 \in F^{s+1}(\phi)$ then either $\text{supp}(f_1) \subseteq \text{supp}(f_2)$ or $\text{supp}(f_1) \cap \text{supp}(f_2) = \emptyset$.

So let $\phi \in K_m \setminus K_{m-1}$. By the 1-unconditionallity of (e_k) we may and will assume that there is $\ell \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\text{supp}(\phi) = \cup_{k=1}^\ell \text{supp}(x_k)$ and the x_k s and ϕ have only non-negative coordinates.

Definition B. Let $\phi, (x_k)_{k=1}^\ell$ be as above. Let $\{F^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$ be a fixed analysis of ϕ . For $k = 1, \dots, \ell$ we set

$$s_k = \begin{cases} \max\{s : 0 \leq s < m \text{ and there are at least two } f_1, f_2 \in F^s(\phi) \\ \text{such that } f_i(x_k) > 0, i = 1, 2\}, \\ \text{when this set is non - empty} \\ 0, \quad \text{when } \text{supp}(x_k) \text{ is a singleton.} \end{cases}$$

So for each $k = 1, \dots, \ell$ there exists a family $f_1^k, \dots, f_{d_k}^k$, $1 \leq d_k \leq n$ of successive functionals in $F^{s_k}(\phi)$ such that for each $i = 1, \dots, d_k$, $f_i^k(x_k) > 0$ and

$\text{supp}(x_k) \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^{d_k} \text{supp}(f_i)$. We define the **initial part** x'_k and the **final part** x''_k of x_k with respect to $\{F^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$ as follows:

$$x'_k = x_k|_{\text{supp}(f_1^k)}$$

$$x''_k = x_k|_{\cup_{i=2}^{d_k} \text{supp}(f_i^k)}$$

($x''_k = 0$ if $\text{supp}(x_k)$ is a singleton).

Our aim is to show that

$$\phi\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} x'_k\right) \leq \frac{1}{\theta} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} a_k e_k \right\|$$

and

$$\phi\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} x''_k\right) \leq \frac{1}{\theta} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} a_k e_k \right\|$$

Since the proofs of these inequalities are similar we shall only prove the first. In particular we shall show by induction on $s \leq m$ that for every $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and every $f \in F^s(\phi)$

$$(*) \quad \left| f\left(\sum_{k \in J} a_k x_k\right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\theta} \left\| \sum_{k \in J} a_k e_k \right\|.$$

(*) is clear for $s = 0$. Suppose that we know (*) for $s < m$; we shall prove it for $s + 1$.

Let $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. Let $f \in F^{s+1}(\phi)$, $f = \theta(f_1 + \dots + f_d)$ with $d \leq n$, $(f_i)_{i=1}^d$ successive members of $F^s(\phi)$. Consider the sets

$$K = \{k \in J : \text{there exists } i \in \{1, \dots, d-1\} \text{ such that } f_i(x'_k) > 0 \text{ and } f_{i+1}(x'_k) > 0\}$$

$$I = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq d \text{ and there exists } K \in J \text{ such that } \text{supp}(x'_k) \subset \text{supp}(f_i)\}$$

Claim . $|K| + |I| \leq n$.

Proof of the claim . Let $k \in K$. Then there exists $i < d$ such that $f_i(x'_k) > 0$ and $f_{i+1}(x'_k) > 0$. This means that $s < s_k$, so there exists $f \in F^{s_k}(\phi)$ with $\text{supp}(f_{i+1}) \subseteq \text{supp}(f)$. Then $f(x'_k) > 0$. But if $f \in F^{s_k}(\phi)$ and $f(x'_k) > 0$ then by the definition of x'_k , $\max \text{supp}(x'_k) = \max \text{supp}(f)$. So $\text{supp}(f_{i+1}) \subset \text{supp}(x'_k)$. Thus $i + 1 \notin I$. Therefore we can define a one-to-one map $G : K \rightarrow \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus I$; hence $|K| \leq d - |I| \leq n - |I|$.

We proceed with the proof of the inductive step. For $i \in I$ set

$E_i = \{k \in J : \text{supp}(x'_k) \subseteq \text{supp}(f_i)\}$. Ofcourse $E_i \cap K = \emptyset$ for every $i \in I$. We have

$$f\left(\sum_{k \in J} a_k x'_k\right) = \theta \sum_{k \in J} f_i(a_k x'_k) = \theta \left[\sum_{i \in I} f_i\left(\sum_{k \in E_i} a_k x'_k\right) + \sum_{k \in K} \left(\sum_{k=1}^d f_i\right)(a_k x'_k) \right].$$

By the inductive hypothesis and the fact that for each $k \in J$

$\sum_{k \in K} (\sum_{i=1}^d f_i)(a_k x'_k) \leq \frac{1}{\theta} \|a_k x_k\| = \frac{1}{\theta} \|a_k e_k\|$, we get

$$f(\sum_{k \in J} a_k x'_k) \leq \theta \left(\frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{i \in I} \|E_i(\sum_{k \in J} a_k e_k)\| + \frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{k \in K} \|a_k e_k\| \right) \leq \frac{1}{\theta} \left\| \sum_{k \in J} a_k e_k \right\|$$

using the fact that $|K| + |I| \leq n$ and the implicit equation satisfied by the norm.

The proof of the inductive step and thus the proof of Step 3 are complete.

Step 4

For all ℓ and all rational non-negative $(r_j)_{j=1}^\ell$

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^\ell r_j^{\frac{1}{p}} e_j \right\| \geq \frac{1}{2n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^\ell r_j \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

Proof . Write $r_j = \frac{k_j}{k}$, $k_j, k \in \mathbf{N}$. Set $s_0 = 0$, $s_j = k_1 + \dots + k_j$ and $u_j = \sum_{i=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} e_i$, $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. By Step 1, $\|u_j\| \leq k_j^{\frac{1}{p}}$. So

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^\ell r_j^{\frac{1}{p}} e_j \right\| = \frac{1}{k^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^\ell k_j^{\frac{1}{p}} e_j \right\| \geq \frac{1}{k^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^\ell \|u_j\| e_j \right\|$$

by unconditionality.

By Step 3

$$\frac{1}{k^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^\ell \|u_j\| e_j \right\| \geq \frac{\theta}{2} \frac{1}{k^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^\ell \|u_j\| \frac{u_j}{\|u_j\|} \right\| = \frac{\theta}{2} \frac{1}{k^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^\ell \sum_{i=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} e_i \right\| = \frac{\theta}{2} \frac{1}{k^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell} e_i \right\|$$

By Step 2, $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell} e_i \right\| \geq \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{p}}} s_\ell^{\frac{1}{p}}$ so setting $\theta = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{q}}}$ we get

$$\frac{\theta}{2} \frac{1}{k^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell} e_i \right\| \geq \frac{1}{2n} \frac{s_\ell^{\frac{1}{p}}}{k^{\frac{1}{p}}} = \frac{1}{2n} \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^\ell k_j}{k} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \frac{1}{2n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^\ell r_j \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Step 4 and the unconditionality of $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ imply that $\left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| \geq \frac{1}{2n} (\sum |a_k|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ for all coefficients (a_k) . This fact combined with Step 1 completes the proof of the Theorem.

Remark . The result of the Theorem can also be deduced by Steps 1, 2 and 3 using a well known Theorem of Zippin [Z].

REFERENCES

- [T] B. S. Tsirelson, Not every Banach space contains ℓ^p or c_0 , *Funct. Anal. App.* 8 (1974), p. 138-141
- [Z] M. Zippin, On perfectly homogeneous bases in Banach spaces, *Israel J. of Math.* 4 (1966), p. 265-272